


AT LEW



Greenblum and Bernstein P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston VA 20191-1411

Date: May 3, 2006

**To:** Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Subject:** Misdirected Mail for U.S.  
Application No. 09/622,656

The above-referenced firm is returning the enclosed Order Returning Undocketed Appeal To Examiner which was received on April 25, 2006. Please note that we are not attorneys of record in the above listed case.


Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

C.C. Pearne & Gordon LLP  
1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland OH 44114

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



\_\_\_\_\_  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCE  
\_\_\_\_\_



Ex parte TAKAKO HIROSE, HIROMI WADA, YASUNORI TANAKA,  
ATSUNOBU KATO, MASAHARU NAKATSUCHI and KEIZABURO SASAKI

\_\_\_\_\_  
Application 09/622,656  
\_\_\_\_\_

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER  
\_\_\_\_\_

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) on April 6, 2006. A review of the application has revealed that the application is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the examiner. The matter requiring attention prior to docketing are identified below.

A review of the file indicates that on September 2, 2005, appellants filed an Appeal Brief under the rules set forth in 37 CFR § 41.37(c). However, the Appeal Brief filed on September 2, 2005, does not fully comply with the new rules under 37 CFR § 41.37(c).

37 CFR § 41.37(c) states in part:

(c)(1) The brief shall contain the following items under appropriate headings and in the order indicated in paragraphs (c)(1)(I) through (c)(1)(x) of this section, except that a brief filed by an appellant who is not represented by a registered practitioner need only substantially comply with paragraphs (c)(1)(I) through (c)(1)(iv) and (c)(1)(vii) through (c)(1)(x) of this section:

(ix) **Evidence appendix.** An appendix containing copies of any evidence submitted pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered in the record by the examiner. Reference to unentered evidence is not permitted in the brief. See § 41.33 for treatment of evidence submitted after appeal. This appendix may also include copies of the evidence relied upon by the examiner as to grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal.

(x) **Related proceedings appendix.** An appendix containing copies of decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section.

An in-depth review of the Appeal Brief indicates that the following sections are missing from the Appeal Brief filed September 2, 2005:

- 1) "Evidence Appendix," as set forth in 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ix); and

Application 09/622,656

2) "Related Proceedings Appendix," as set forth in 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(x).

It is required that a supplemental Appeal Brief be submitted that is in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c). For more information on the Board's new rules, please see the web page entitled "More Information on the Rules of Practice Before the BPAI," Final Rule at:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/fr2004/moreinfo.html>.

Also, in the Examiner's Answer mailed November 16, 2005 is not in compliance with the requirements of 37 CFR § 41.37. The following headings are missing from the Examiner's Answer:

- 1) "Evidence relied upon" - A list of the evidence relied on (e.g., patents, publications, admitted prior art), and, in the case of nonpatent references, the relevant page or pages.
- 2) "Related proceeding appendix" - Copies of any decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified by the examiner in the "Related Appeals and Interferences" section of the answer

A revised Examiner's Answer that is in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37 is required.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is return to the Examiner:

Application 09/622,656

- 1) hold the Appeal Brief filed on September 2, 2005, defective;
- 2) to notify appellants to file a supplemental Appeal Brief in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37 or for the examiner to present a statement regarding the position taken on the missing appendices;
- 3) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed November 16, 2005, and submit a revised Examiner's Answer in accordance with the new rules effective September 13, 2004 with the appropriate notation of an appeal conference; and
- 4) for such further action as may be appropriate.

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dale M. Shaw', is written over a horizontal line.

DALE M. SHAW  
Program and Resource Administrator  
(571) 272-9797

DMS/pgc

cc: Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191